DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 217 IR 014 856

AUTHOR Craig, R. Stephen
TITLE A Content Analysis Comparing Gender Images in Network Television Commercials Aired in Daytime, Evening, and Weekend Telecasts.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 85p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advertising; Audience Analysis; Content Analysis; Sex Differences; *Sex Stereotypes; *Television Commercials; Television Viewing

ABSTRACT

A content analysis comparing gender portrayals in 2,209 network television commercials was conducted. Many earlier studies treated television advertising's portrayal of men as unproblematic and excluded ads aimed specifically at men from the study sample. To address this shortcoming, the sample was chosen from three different day parts: (1) daytime, when women make up the majority of the audience and are the primary target for advertisers; (2) evening prime time, when the sex of audience members is more evenly distributed; and (3) weekend afternoon sportscasts, when men make up a large percentage of the viewing audience. Samples were analyzed on a number of factors including sex and age of the primary visual character; function of primary visual character as authority on or user of the product; role of the primary character; category of product such as food, body, or services; setting in which the product was portrayed; the reward promised by the product advertisement; and the sex and age of all other characters. The results indicate that there are large and consistent differences in the way men and women are portrayed in television commercials in the three day parts. Although ads in all day parts tended to portray men in stereotypical roles of authority and dominance, those on weekends tended to emphasize escape from home and family. The findings of earlier studies which do not consider day part difference may now have to be re-evaluated. A glossary of operational definitions used by the encoders is included. (22 tables, 63 references) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED329217

A Content Analysis Comparing Gender Images in Network Television Commercials Aired in Daytime, Evening, and Weekend Telecasts

R. Stephen Craig

Department of Journalism & Mass Communication

University of Maine
Orono, ME 04469

1991

IR014850

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stephen Craig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

A content analysis comparing gender portrayals in 2,209 network television commercials was conducted. Many earlier studies treated television advertising's portrayal of men as unproblematic and excluded ads aimed specifically at men from the study sample. To address this shortcoming, the sample was chosen from three different day parts: daytime, when women make up the majority of the audience and are the primary target for advertisers; evening prime time, when the sex of audience members is more evenly distributed; and weekend afternoon sportscasts, when men make up a large percentage of the audience. The results indicate that there are large and consistent differences in the way men and women are portrayed in these three day parts, with almost all comparisons reaching significance at the .05 level. Although ads in all day parts tended to portray men in stereotypical roles of authority and dominance, those on weekends tended to emphasize escape from home and family. The findings of earlier studies which did not consider day part differences may now have to be re-evaluated.

In the past eighteen years, a considerable number of content analyses of gender images in television commercials have been conducted. Growing from the concerns of the women's movement about negative stereotyping in advertising, these studies have consistently supported the contention that TV ads generally portray women in the traditional roles of subservience allocated them by a patriarchal society. In a 1988 review of this research, Bretl & Cantor concluded that "some changes in the direction of more equal presentation of men and women have occurred, but several differences remain" (p. 606).

Virtually all of this earlier research has focused on images of women. Portrayals of men, where they have been studied at all, have been seen as unproblematic and even as the laudatory standard by which female portrayals could be measured. Furthermore, past research has all but ignored the heavy reliance advertisers place on demographics in their design of commercials and in their purchasing of television time. The result has been that past studies have selected commercial samples from only one or two day parts in which women are the primary audience, or have mixed their sample from all day parts with little or no distinction made between them.

This paper reports the results of a content analysis of 2,209 television commercials which attempts to remedy these shortcomings. First, it considers the traditional stereotypes of both women and men seen in television advertising to be problem-

atic, and attempts to fill in the gaps of past research by focusing on images of men. Second, it recognizes that television commercials are not homogeneous units randomly scattered throughout the broadcast day, but vary greatly in form and content with the age, sex, and social situation of the audience the advertiser intends to reach. For this reason, it uses the day part as the major independent variable, and especially concentrates on differences between ads seen during the daytime, when housewives make up most of the audience, and those seen on weekends, when men viewers predominate.

Background of the Study

In May, 1972, the New York Times Magazine published an article by two members of the New York Chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW) reporting their findings after eighteen months of monitoring portrayals of women in television commercials (Hennessee & Nicholson, 1972). NOW's informal study of 1,241 ads found that "almost all of them showed women inside the home," and that a high percentage of these women were shown doing household tasks or being domestic adjuncts to men (p. 12).

Such stereotypical images of women in advertising had previously been a major topic of criticism by Betty Friedan in her landmark feminist work The Feminine Mystique (1963, Ch. 9), but the NOW study was the first attempt to present quantitative documentation of the portrayal of women in TV ads to a wide audience. While NOW's methodology did not meet the strict stand-

ards of most academic content analyses (Gunter, 1986, p.19), it did have the effect of awakening the attention of many scholars to the need for such research. Indeed, since 1972, 18 major content analyses of U.S. television commercials dealing with gender portrayals have been reported in academic sources, and another seven studies using samples of non - U.S. television commercials have also been published (see Tables 1 and 2). In addition, many other projects have studied gender portrayals in the television programs themselves as well as in other types of advertising. Courtney & Whipple (1983), Gunter (1986), Kear (1985), Macklin & Kolbe (1984), Seggar, Hafen, & Hannonen-Gladden (1981), Skelly & Lundstrom (1981), and Steeves (1987), have all summarized various aspects of this work.

Table 1

Content Analyses of U. S. Television Commercials Reporting Gender Comparisons[a]

Author(s)	Year Published	Reported Days & Times Sampled
*Dominick & Rauch	1972	7:30 - 11 p.m. All days of week
*Silverstein & Silverstein	1974	8 - 11 p.m. Weeknights
Doolittle & Pepper	1975	9 a.m. - 1 p.m. Saturday
Verna	1975	9 a.m. - Noon Saturday
McArthur & Resko	1975	10 - Noon 1:30 - 3:30 p.m. 8 - 10 p.m. Weekdays

Table 1 (continued)

Author(s)	Year Published	Reported Days & Times Sampled
O'Kelly & Bloomquist	1976	7 a.m - Midnight All days of week
*Culley & Bennett	1976	"Prime-time" All days of week
Marecek, et al.	1978	6 a.m.- 1 a.m. All days of week
*O'Donnell & O'Donnell	1978	8 - 10 p.m. All days of week
Scheibe	1979	"Divided evenly across all times of the week"
*Schneider & Schneider	1979	7 - 10 p.m. CST Days not reported
*Meyers	1980	Prime Time All days of week
Knill, et al.	1981	1 - 4 p.m. 8 - 1 p.m. Weekdays
Mamay & Simpson	1981	8 - 10 a.m. 1 - 3 p.m. 9 - 11 p.m. Weekdays
Scheibe & Condry	1984	7 a.m - 1 a.m. All days of week
*Downs & Harrison	1985	8 a.m. - 10 p.m. CST All days of week
Bretl & Cantor	1988	9 a.m. - 11 a.m. 7 p.m. - 9 p.m. All days of week
*Lovdal	1989	8 p.m. - 10 p.m. All days of week

Note. See text for discussion of studies marked with an asterisk.

[a] After a similar table in Bretl & Cantor (1988).

Table 2

Content Analyses of non-U. S. Television Commercials Reporting Gender Comparisons

Author(s)	Year	Reported Days & Times Sampled	Country
Manstead & McColloch	1981	6 - 11:30 p.m. All days of week	Britain
Chappell	1983	7:30 - 10 p.m. Over two weeks	Britain
Harris & Stobart	1986	Noon - 6 p.m. & 6 p.m. - midnight Weekdays	Britain
Livingstone & Green	1986	6 - 11 p.m. All days of week	Britain
Rak & McMullen	1987	"During the weekdays" Daytime & Prime Time	Canada
Gilly	1988	8 a.m. - 4 p.m. Tues, 7 - 11 p.m. Wed	U.S., Mexico, & Australia
Furnham & Voli	1989	11 a.m. - 2 p.m., 4 p.m. - 7 p.m., & 8 p.m. - 11 p.m. All days of week	Italy

These studies have generally been based in feminist or socialization theories concerning the socially constructed nature of gender, and have sought to investigate how representations of men and women such as those seen in television commercials help construct and reinforce our sex role concepts. Given this history, and the initial goals of feminist scholarship, it is not surprising that the focus of these studies has been almost exclu-

sively on women. After surveying much of this research, Bretl and Cantor (1988) summarized it in this way:

> The content analyses of male and female portrayals in television commercials have been related to the question of whether women's depictions are "stereotyped," showing an inaccurate and narrow view of women's roles in our society. (p. 596) (emphasis added)

With the exception of a single study by Meyers (1980), no major research has been conducted primarily to investigate stereotyped presentations of men in television commercials. Durkin (1985) has commented on this fact:

> For obvious social rather than scientific reasons, most analyses so far have concentrated on the female role; the male sex role in television tends to be illustrated by default, and is often assumed to be the converse of whatever characteristics are identified as associated with the female stereotype. An explanatory theory of sex-role stereotyping and its effects will require an extensive account of cultural expectations imposed upon both sexes. (p. 110)

Meyers (1980, p. 7) has described the results of this lack of attention to portrayals of men: "it appears that while women are making some progress [in reducing negative stereotypes on television], men are continuing to be socialized into stereotypical roles of dominance and superiority."

In recent years, however, some scholars have begun to focus a more critical eye on the ways our culture portrays men and masculinity. Based in feminist theory's contributions regarding the social construction of gender, "men's studies" has emerged as

a cross-disciplinary investigation. Beginning in the 1970's with such authors and editors as David and Brannon (1976), Farrell (1974), Fasteau (1974), and Pleck and Sawyer (1974), men's studies has produced a substantial body of literature, and August (1985) has compiled a bibliography on the topic.

Despite the fact that it focuses on men, men's studies should not be seen as anti-feminist. Brod (1987) explains that like women's studies, men's studies also "attempts to emasculate patriarchal ideology's masquerade as knowledge" and that "men's studies can be seen as a necessary compliment to women's studies, needed to bring to completion the feminist project, which motivates them both" (p. 264). The focus of men's studies on men and the social construction of masculinity, then, is an attempt to reveal the sources of patriarchal power and, in so doing, disconnect them.

However, men and masculinity are just beginning to be a topic in television research and criticism. Both Fiske (1987) and Schwichtenberg (1987) have written on images of masculinity in a television action series, but to date, only a content analysis by Meyers (1980) and limited textual analyses by Craig (1987), Farrell (1974), and Postman, Nystrom, Strate, & Weingartner (1987) have focused specifically on images of men in television commercials. Kervin (1988, November), Skelly & Lundstrom (1981) and Wernick (1987) have analyzed the male image in print ads.

But a lack of interest in stereotypical portrayals of male characters in commercials is only one aspect of the failure of past research. Perhaps equally problematic has been the lack of specific interest in men as viewers of commercials. A few theorists (e.g. Ellis, 1982; Mulvey, 1975; and Neale, 1983) have discussed how men watch cinema, and others (e.g. Barwise & Ehrenberg, 1988; Kim, Baran, & Massey, 1988) have investigated how family members select programs and control home viewing patterns, but little consideration has been given to the particulars of men's viewing patterns or to how men in the audience are seen by television advertisers. Therefore, despite the fact that demographic targeting is a major force in the advertising industry, most past content analyses have treated commercials as homogeneous and failed to consider whether and how ads aimed at men differ from those aimed at women.

Gendered Television, Gendered Commercials

In his book Television Culture (1987, Chs 10, 11), John Fiske discusses "gendered television," making the point that the television industry successfully designs some programs for men and others for women. He then illustrates the textual differences between the two forms with a close analysis of a feminine form (the soap opera) and a masculine form (the action series).

This gendering of television narrative form is the direct result of the economic practices of the television and advertising industries. Advertisers have long used gender, age, and other demographic descriptors of an audience to match the promo-

tion of products with the consumers most likely to buy them, so detergent commercials appear on soap operas while beer ads are found on the weekend football game. Networks, anxious to please their advertising customers, provide gendered programs to deliver the demographics advertisers seek, so that "feminine" programs are expected to attract more women viewers and "masculine" programs, more men.

Audience research indicates that women generally watch television 16% more than men and almost always outnumber men in the television audience (Farhi, 1988, September 11). The figures in Table 3 are based on Nielsen estimates for Fall, 1988, and indicate the gender proportions of adult viewers during three selected time periods, or "day parts." These numbers indicate that women make up over two-thirds of the adult viewing audience on weekday afternoons during the hours in which programming traditionally includes soap operas. The only day part when men routinely form the largest proportion of the viewing audience is weekend afternoons, periods traditionally used for sports telecasts. Prime time audiences are more evenly divided, but women viewers still outnumber men.

But if programming is designed to appeal to one group or another, then surely so must be the commercials that are the programs' reason for being. Since most previous content analyses of television commercials have been designed to focus on images of women, they have generally overlooked the weekend periods when men predominate in the audience. Of the studies listed in

Table 1, eight (those marked with an asterisk) examined only commercials aired during the evening hours. Two others (Doolittle & Pepper, 1974; Verna, 1975) restricted their sample to children's programs on Saturday morning. The remaining drew their samples from more than one day part, but at least two of these (Marecek, et al., 1978; and Scheibe, 1979) apparently made no attempt to examine day part differences.

Table 3

Estimates of Proportions of Men and Women Television Viewers in Different Day Parts

	Percent		
	Daytime[a]	Evening[b]	Weekend[c]
Men	32.4	45.7	52.6
Women	67.6	54.3	47.4

Note. Source: Nielsen (1988). All numbers represent column percentages. Figures do not include viewers under 18.

[a] Monday through Friday, 1:00 - 4:30 p.m. EST.

[b] Monday through Sunday, 8:00 - 11:00 p.m. EST.

[c] The mean of Saturday and Sunday, 1:00 - 4:30 p.m. EST.

This means that only six of the earlier studies using a U.S. sample have compared the content of ads aired at different times of the day. Of these, four (McArthur & Resko, 1975; Knill, Pesch, Pursey, Gilpin, & Perloff, 1981; Mamay & Simpson, 1981;

Bretl & Cantor, 1988) offer only comparisons of daytime commercials with those in prime time. The remaining two studies (O'Kelly & Bloomquist, 1976; Scheibe & Condry, 1984) sampled from all times of the day and week, but offer comparisons only by program type.

Therefore, no previous content analysis has closely examined gender portrayals during the weekend sports period when the proportion of male viewers is at its highest, and when advertisers flood the airwaves with commercials aimed at men. Scheibe & Condry (1984, p. 32) did examine commercials by program type, including a limited comparison of those shown during soap operas with those shown during sports programs, making this the only previous content analysis to compare ads aimed at women with those aimed at men. Their research, which focused on the "values" expressed in ads, found that

> . . . those commercials targeted to females were more likely to stress the importance of being helpful, beautiful, youthful, cheerful and obedient, and of seeking happiness and family well-being. Those aimed at males were more likely to stress the importance of being capable, ambitious, responsible, independent and physically powerful, and of seeking accomplishment, physical comfort, and an exciting and a prosperous life. (pp. 42-43).

Such findings are not unexpected, given the past twenty years of research and theory concerning gender stereotypes. Chavetz (1978) summarized masculine and feminine gender role stereotypes for seven human characteristics, based on her 1971 study of student attitudes. She found masculine traits were

described by such adjectives as "athletic," "breadwinner," "sexually aggressive," "unemotional," "logical," "dominating," etc. Feminine traits were described by such adjectives as "weak," "domestic," "sexually passive," "emotional," "intuitive," "dependent," etc. (pp. 38-39).

Thompson and Pleck (1987) found similar attitudes about what the male role should be reflected in a more recent study of 400 college men. After a factor analysis of subject responses, their data revealed three major dimensions of perceived masculinity: "status," which relates to "men's need to achieve status and others' respect;" "toughness," "that men should be mentally, emotionally, and physically tough and self-reliant;" and "anti-femininity," "the belief that men should avoid stereotypically feminine activities and occupations" (p. 28).

It is reasonable to assume that such gender stereotypes are widely held by Americans. It is also reasonable to assume that such stereotypes will appear in portrayals of men in the media, including television ads. In a textual analysis, Postman, et al. (1987), examined the "cultural myths" and messages present in a sample of 40 beer commercials. Arguing that "beer commercials can be viewed . . . as a manual of cultural information on what it means to be a man" (p. 44), they found that the ads promoted such traits as physical activity, risk-taking, mastery over nature and technology, egalitarianism, and emotional self-restraint. In their relationships with women, men were portrayed

as "confident, cool, and detached" (p. 48). Farrell (1974) explains that

> The counterpart of the media's housebound-mother-wife-maid-mistress is the infallibly successful, accomplished, virile male. . . . By presenting a consistent, unattainable myth of what every man should be, the advertiser hopes the consumer will identify with the product that is associated with this image, settling for a vicarious realization of this standard. (pp. 105, 109)

However, there is also evidence that men and women do not share identical values concerning ideals of masculinity. A 1980 poll by The Roper Organization found that when asked what three or four qualities they most admire in a man, 51% of the women in the sample listed "sensitivity" and 42% listed "gentleness" while only 30% and 13% of the men did so. Further, 40% and 31% of the men listed "leadership ability" and "frankness" as admirable qualities, compared with only 24% and 17% of the women (p. 30).

This study is designed to investigate whether and how these male (and female) stereotypes are exploited in the design and placement of ads. Specifically it attempts to answer the following questions. How are men portrayed in television ads? How do advertisers attempt to appeal to male television viewers in their ads? How do portrayals of men in ads differ when aimed at different audiences?

This study is a preliminary attempt to quantify the images of men in network television commercials as a basis for further study. As Fiske and Hartley (1978) have pointed out, "The start-

ing-point of any study of television must be with what is actually there on the screen. This is what content analysis is concerned to establish" (p. 21). However, quantitative methods can only provide a framework for further textual analysis which examines the subtle and complex meanings created by viewers.

Method

The Sample

Three videotape recorders were used to simultaneously record selected hours of programming on the local affiliates of NBC, CBS, and ABC during the period January 6 - 14, 1990. To reflect the gender makeup of television audiences at different times, three day parts were separately sampled. The daytime day part was chosen for its high percentage of women viewers, the weekend day part for its high percentage of men viewers, and prime time as a basis for comparison with past studies and the other day parts. Hours were selected as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4

Day Part Distribution of the Study Sample

Day Part	Days	Times (EST)	Programming
Daytime	M - F	2 - 4 p.m.	Soap Operas[a]
Evening	M - F	9 - 11 p.m.	Prime Time
Weekend	Sat & Sun	Afternoons	Sports[b]

[a] "Another World," "Santa Barbara," "As the World Turns," "Guiding Light," "One Life to Live," and "General Hospital."

[b] See Table 5.

This procedure yielded two hours per day for the five consecutive weekdays for each of the three networks for a total of 30 hours of recorded programming during the daytime period and 30 hours of recorded programming during the evening period. Since weekend sports telecasts are less regular in their scheduling, times were chosen on four consecutive Saturday and Sunday afternoons when network sports were scheduled. This procedure yielded a total of 39.5 hours of recorded programming during the weekend period as shown in Table 5. Television sports programming is seasonal, both in terms of the sport covered and the size of the audience generated. The weekends selected for this sample were purposely chosen to include the time periods when the professional football championships were being played. It is reasonable to assume that viewing during these periods was higher than at most other times of year. It is also reasonable to assume that sponsors with men as their target audience would find these particular weekends especially desirable as advertising purchases.

Each tape was reviewed and each cluster of commercials (i.e. each group of ads between two program segments) was examined, cataloged, and its location marked on the videotape using the VCR's electronic indexing feature. Clusters containing only promotional announcements, public service announcements, and/or advertisements clearly originating at the local station were disregarded. Each cluster of commercials was assigned a serial number and a total of 664 commercial clusters were thus obtained, with each cluster containing one to seven different commercials.

Table 5

Derivation of Hours Making Up the Weekend Sample

Day(Date)	Network	Times (p.m. EST)	Program[a]
Sat(1/6)	NBC	12:30 - 4:00	AFC Playoff (Football)
Sat(1/6)	CBS	1:00 - 4:00	College Basketball
Sat(1/6)	CBS	4:00 - 7:00	NFC Playoff (Football)
Sun(1/7)	CBS	12:00 - 4:00	NFC Playoff (Football)
Sun(1/7)	NBC	3:30 - 7:00	AFC Playoff (Football)
Sun(1/7)	ABC	3:00 - 6:00	Golf
Sun(1/7)	CBS	4:00 - 6:00	College Basketball
Sat(1/13)	ABC	4:30 - 6:00	Wide World of Sports
Sat(1/13)	CBS	1:00 - 4:00	College Basketball
Sat(1/13)	NBC	3:30 - 7:00	Hula Bowl (Football)
Sat(1/13)	CBS	4:00 - 6:00	College Basketball
Sun(1/14)	NBC	1:00 - 5:30	AFL Championship (Ftball)
Sun(1/14)	CBS	5:00 - 8:00	NFC Championship (Ftball)

[a] Recording also included pre- and post- game and sports news shows (e.g. NFL Today) falling in the time period.

A computer program was used to randomize the serial numbers and the 664 commercial clusters were then edited onto new video tapes in this random order. Given the large number of commercials to be sorted and copied, randomization of each individual commercial was rejected as impractical, and the compromise of randomizing only the clusters was adopted as a sufficient substi-

tute. All program material, public service announcements, billboards, promotional announcements, and advertisements clearly originating at the local station were deleted. (Local ads and those believed by their placement to be "spot" ads were deleted, since commercial scheduling and production values vary greatly with market size. Therefore, to insure maximum generalizability, only network commercials were included in the sample.) This procedure yielded a series of eight videotapes containing only the network commercials, randomized by cluster, with all clues removed as to their original program context and time of broadcast.

Some past studies have modified their commercial samples by eliminating duplicate commercials (Marecek, et al.,1978; Schneider & Schneider, 1979; Manstead & McCulloch, 1981; Harris & Stobart, 1984; Bretl & Cantor, 1988), commercials without adult characters (Dominick & Rauch, 1972; Manstead & McCulloch, 1981; McArthur & Resko, 1975; Culley & Bennett, 1976; Harris & Stobart, 1986; Livingstone & Green; Furnham & Voli, 1989), or commercials containing fantasy or animated characters (McArthur & Resko, 1975; Verna, 1975; Manstead & McCulloch, 1981; Furnham & Voli, 1989) from the sample. Some studies have also eliminated commercials in which the central character could not be readily identified (Harris & Stobart, 1986; Furnham & Voli, 1989).

In this study, however, all network commercials recorded during the sample period were included in the initial database, regardless of the number of times they appeared or the ages of

the characters. Animated characters were also included and were coded based on the gender and age they appeared to represent. Repeats were coded since, as Verna (1975, p. 303) points out, the aim of the study is to examine exposure to stereotypes rather than to specific commercials. Each commercial appearance must therefore be considered a separate exposure.

This procedure yielded a total sample of 2,209 commercials to be coded. Due to the industry practice of telecasting more commercials per hour in some day parts than others, and the fact that more weekend hours were recorded, the number of commercials in each day part subsample was not equal. The day part subsamples consisted of 971 commercials originally aired in the daytime period, 498 commercials in the Prime Time evening period, and 740 commercials in the weekend period.

Coders

Two males and one female served as paid coders. Two were graduate students majoring in Speech Communication and the other was an advanced undergraduate majoring in English. Training sessions were held in which the coding procedure was explained and practice codings were undertaken on commercials not part of the study sample.

Coders were told that the study sample commercials had come from "various times during the day and week," but the specific hypotheses of the study and the principal investigator's special interest in day part differences were not revealed. Coders had

no access to information concerning the original order of the commercials nor the program, day, or time of the original broadcasts. Coders were instructed to work independently and to avoid discussing commercial content or coding decisions with the other coders.

Coding categories were based on those which had proven effective in other recent content analyses, especially those of Bretl & Cantor (1988) and Harris & Stobart (1986). Modifications and additions to these earlier categories were made as needed to reflect the hypotheses of the present study. During training, coders were supplied with a written copy of the coding scheme, detailed written instructions defining each coding category (see Appendix), and instructions on using the computer. Coders were taught to enter data directly into a personal computer using the commercial computer program "dBase III." A special data entry screen was designed which duplicated the coding scheme and reduced the likelihood of errors.

Coding stations were established consisting of a VCR with color monitor next to a personal computer. In this way, coders could watch each commercial, stop the VCR, then code data directly into the computer. Coders were encouraged to replay commercials as many times as was necessary to ensure proper coding. A stopwatch was provided for timing where necessary.

Reliability

One subsample of 30 commercials was selected for a reliability check and coded by all three coders. Each commercial required nine coding decisions for a total of 270 decisions on the 30 commercials. Majority agreement was obtained on 97% (263) of the decisions. On the seven items without majority agreement, the coders, under the direction of the principal investigator, reviewed the commercials in question and discussed the discrepant items until majority agreement was reached.

Krippendorf (1980, Ch. 12), argues that his alpha statistic for a small sample is a far more effective measure of inter-coder reliability than the simple percentage of agreement, since it takes into consideration the number of coders, the number of categories for each item, and the effects of chance. Thus, alpha reflects the degree of inter-coder agreement above that which would be expected by chance alone.

Inter-coder reliability was calculated using Krippendorf's alpha for three coders. To check whether the sex of the coder affected reliability, alpha was also calculated for the three possible coder pairings: Male1 x Male2, Male1 x Female, and Male2 x Female. The results of these calculations are shown in Table 6.

No readily apparent pattern of differences was found in the alpha levels between the male coders and the male and female

coder pairings. Coder sex was therefore considered to have had no significant effect on the coding outcome.

Table 6

Inter-coder Reliability as Measured by Krippendorf's Alpha

Item Coded	Krippendorf's Alpha			
	Male1 x Male2	Male1 x Female	Male2 x Female	Three Coders Combined
Primary Visual Character	.91	.89	.93	.82
Primary Character Credibility	.78	.77	.83	.59
Primary Character Role	.83	.77	.79	.62
All Visual Characters	.90	.89	.92	.82
Primary Narrator	.96	1.00	.96	.92
Product Category	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Primary Setting	.84	.88	.80	.64
Reward Category	.93	.82	.83	.71

Krippendorf (1980, pp. 146-147) points out that while no particular level of inter-coder agreement can be considered satisfactory for all studies, a policy of using .80 as a minimum alpha for reporting variables, with a level of .67 to .80 used only for "drawing highly tentative and cautious conclusions," has been used in some past research. However, he also points out that "if it is an exploratory study without serious consequences,

that level may be relaxed considerably," and that "some content analyses are very robust in the sense that unreliabilities become hardly noticeable in the result" (p. 147). It is argued here that this research meets both the criterion of being exploratory, and the criterion of being robust, owing both to the relatively large sample size and the large differences found ($p < .001$ in most major comparisons). In addition, many of the coding categories are based on similar categories in past studies, and many findings are supported by earlier research. Even so, it is felt that conclusions using the item for which alpha for the combined coders is less than .60 ("Primary Character Credibility") must be approached with caution.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Data was entered by coders directly into computers using the program dBase III. After compilation and organization, the raw data was transferred to the MS-DOS version of the data analysis computer program SYSTAT. Statistical analysis was completed using the "Tables" subprogram, and the Pearson chi-square calculation was used to test for significant differences. For analyses of three-way interactions, log-linear modeling was conducted as suggested by Fienberg (1980) using the Tables "Model" command and the Pearson chi-square of the model is reported (Wilkinson, 1989, ch. 28).

Results

As Bretl and Cantor (1988) have noted, the manner of coding characters in past content analyses has varied considerably. Multiple studies (e.g. Verna (1975), Mamay & Simpson (1981), and Downs & Harrison (1985)) coded most of the characters who appear in each commercial of the sample, classifying them by such categories as age, sex, role, etc. Others (e.g. Dominick & Rauch (1972), Culley & Bennett (1976), Schneider & Schneider (1979)) restricted their coding to only those characters who appeared on screen for at least three seconds and/or had at least one line of dialogue. Still another group (e.g. McArthur and Resko (1975), Manstead & McCulloch (1981), & Bretl & Cantor (1988)) coded only the one or two characters who seemed to have the primary or dominant role in the commercial.

In the present study, a combination of these approaches was used. First, a single "primary visual character" was coded. This was defined as "the one visual character who appears on the screen for the longest time, but for no less than five seconds" (for the more detailed operational definition of this and other terms, see Appendix). Next, each commercial was also coded based on the sex and age of all visual characters appearing in the commercial, regardless of the amount of time seen. Finally, the sex of the "primary narrator" was coded.

Sex and Age of the Primary Visual Character

Coders were instructed to indicate whether the primary visual character was an adult male, an adult female, a child or a teen, or if no character meeting the established criteria appeared. Table 7 indicates the results.

Table 7

Percentages of Primary Visual Characters in Four Sex & Age Categories Appearing in Commercials During Three Day Parts

		Percent		
Category	N	Daytime (N=971)	Evening (N=498)	Weekend (N=740)
Adult Male	792	27	31	50
Adult Female	639	42	29	12
Child or Teen	177	11	7	5
None or Unclear	601	20	32	33

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (6, N=2209) = 241.4, $p < .001$.

Pretesting had revealed that many commercials are produced in a style in which numerous characters appear only fleetingly in a montage of images, with no one character appearing to be central to the presentation. Since the intent of the primary character coding was to focus on the single most important character in the ad, a five second minimum appearance was established

before a character could be coded as the primary visual character (characters who were only heard and not seen were considered narrators (see below)). This procedure resulted in 27% of the overall sample being coded as "none or unclear" in the primary visual character category. But as Table 7 indicates, an absence of codable primary visual characters was much more prevalent in weekend (33%) and evening (32%) commercials than in daytime ads (20%).

Children or teens were primary visual characters in only a small percentage of the commercials sampled, but were much more likely to be found in daytime (11%) than in evening (7%) or weekend ads (5%).

Bretl and Cantor (1988) compared results from earlier studies on the percentages of male and female primary characters appearing in the prime time day part as well as on other measures. Most of these findings were based on commercials in which only adult primary characters appear. To allow for this and some of the subsequent comparisons on these measures, the sample was modified by dropping all commercials that were coded as having no adult primary visual character (i.e. those coded as "child or teen" or "none or unclear"), yielding a total of 1,442 commercials which had either adult male or adult female primary visual characters. Table 8 shows these results. (For subsequent tables, the sample used for the comparison is indicated by the table title and the reported sample size (N)).

Table 8

Percentages of Adult Primary Visual Characters by Sex Appearing in Commercials in Three Day Parts

		Percent		
Category	N	Daytime (N=668)	Evening (N=300)	Weekend (N=463)
Adult Male	792	40	52	80
Adult Female	639	60	48	20

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (2, N=1431) = 185.1, $p < .001$.

The Bretl and Cantor comparison indicated that the percentage ratio of male to female primary characters in prime time commercials found in most previous studies was about 50 - 50. That is, men and women were found to be portrayed as primary characters with about equal frequency. The results of the present study agrees with the earlier studies. As Table 8 indicates, men were found to be the primary visual characters in 52% and women in 48% of the commercials aired during the evening hours. However, the findings for the other two day parts are quite different. During the daytime hours, only 40% of the adult primary visual characters were men, but during the weekend period, 80% were.

Analysis of Credibility of Primary Visual Character

Many past studies have examined the basis for the presumed credibility of one or more characters in the commercial. For example, McArthur & Resko (1975) classified characters as "product-users" or "authorities." Bretl & Cantor (1988) used seven categories. The present study adopted the three categories of Manstead & McCulloch (1981) and Harries & Stobart (1986). Each primary visual character was coded as either an "authority," defined as "a person with authoritative information about the product or service based on education, technical knowledge, research or some similar expertise rather than as experience as a user"; a "user," defined as "a user of the product or service, or as someone whose knowledge of the product's abilities came from personal experience"; or "other," defined as all primary visual characters who do not fit into either of the above two categories. The results are indicated in Table 9.

Although the majority of adult primary visual characters in every day part were coded as "users," day part differences were still significant. One unexpected finding was the large day part differences in the "other" category. While only 8% of the daytime characters were coded as "other," 21% of those on the weekend were. Further review of the commercials coded as "other" revealed that in many of them, the primary visual character simply portrays a model or sex object and does not fit the definition of either "authority" or "user." For example, in a beer commercial, the primary visual character is an attractive wait-

ress who serves beer to men customers. She neither uses the product herself nor describes its benefits. In another ad, a woman is seen caressing a car, but seemingly is neither user nor authority. In a daytime ad for a cleanser, a child is seen playing in a clean sink, neither using the product nor acting as the authority.

Table 9

Percentage of Adult Primary Visual Characters in Various Credibility Categories in Three Day Parts

		Percent		
Category	N	Daytime (N=668)	Evening (N=300)	Weekend (N=463)
Authority	120	8	8	9
User	1110	84	75	70
Other	201	8	17	21

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (4, N=1431) = 45.1, $p < .001$.

Table 10 breaks down the data by sex of the primary visual character in each day part. Male primary characters were five times more likely than women to be classified as "authorities" in the daytime (15% vs. 3%) and three times more likely in the evening (12% vs. 4%), but men and women appeared as "authorities" in about equal proportions (9% vs. 8%) during the weekend day part. Women primary characters were almost always portrayed as

"users" during the daytime (93%) and evening (90%) day parts, but less so on the weekends (58%). The finding of a larger proportion of women than men classified as "other" in the weekend day part is in keeping with their frequent appearance as sex objects/models as discussed above, but men were much more likely to be classified as "other" during the daytime or evening periods.

The Role Played by the Primary Visual Character

Most past research has attempted to study gender stereotyping by examining the apparent part or role played by male and female characters in the commercials. In the present study, coders were asked to describe the predominant role played by the primary visual character by indicating one of the categories listed in Table 11. These categories are similar to those used by Harris & Stobart (1986) after those derived by Manstead & McCulloch (1981).

Once again, results indicate large day part differences. Primary characters in weekend commercials were more likely to portray celebrities, professionals and workers than those in daytime commercials, but much less likely to portray children/teens, home-makers, parents, or spouse/partners. Primary visual characters were about equally likely to portray "sex object/models" in all three day parts. A significant percentage of characters in all three day parts were coded as having some "other role." These characters were generally those who did not clearly fit into the categories given. For example, in an ad for

Table 10

Percentage of Adult Primary Visual Characters of Each Sex in Various Credibility Categories Appearing in Commercials During Three Day Parts

		Percent					
		Daytime (N=668)		Evening (N=304)		Weekend (N=466)	
Category	N	Men (N=265)	Women (N=403)	Men (N=155)	Women (N=145)	Men (N=372)	Women (N=91)
Authority	120	15	3	12	4	9	8
User	1110	71	93	61	90	73	58
Other	201	14	4	27	6	18	34

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. Daytime X^2 (2, N=668) = 5.9, $p < .001$; Evening X^2 (2, N=300) = 35.7, $p < .001$; Weekend X^2 (2, N= 463) = 10.9, $p=.004$; 3-way X^2 (4, N=1431) = 65.1, $p < .001$.

Table 11

Percentage of Commercials with Primary Visual Characters in Various Role Categories During Three Day Parts

Category	N	Percent		
		Daytime (N=971)	Evening (N=498)	Weekend (N=740)
Celebrity	241	8	12	14
Child/Teen	161	10	7	4
Homemaker	65	5	2	1
Interviewer/ Demonstrator	164	10	7	4
Parent	125	7	6	4
Professional	212	7	10	12
Sex Object/ Model	126	6	5	6
Spouse/ Partner	153	9	7	4
Worker	95	3	2	7
Other Role	266	14	9	11
No Primary Visual Char.	601	20	32	33

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (20, N=2209) = 180.1, $p < .001$.

cheese, the primary character is a man eating, who does not clearly fit the definition of "interviewer/ demonstrator" nor of "sex object/ model." In another commercial, one for Miller beer,

the primary character is a man who has saved his friend's life and we're told to "buy that man a Miller." Coders were also specifically directed to code all military personnel as "other role."

The data was then modified to allow closer comparison with past studies by dropping those commercials without adult primary characters, breaking out data by sex of the primary visual character, and by combining two categories. The results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12 indicates that male primary characters were much more likely than females to be portrayed as celebrities and professionals in every day part, while women were more likely to be portrayed as interviewer/demonstrators, parent/spouses, or sex object/models in every day part. While women were also proportionately more likely to be portrayed as homemakers and less likely to be portrayed as workers in the daytime and evening, men and women primary characters were about equally likely to be portrayed in these two categories. However, women were proportionately more likely to appear as sex object/models during the weekend than during the day. Men were much more likely to be coded as having some "other role" in all three day parts.

Bretl & Cantor (1988) tabulated the results of six earlier studies on the basis of the proportion of male and female primary characters who were found to be portrayed as a spouse or parent. They found that past studies had always found women more likely

Table 12

Percentage of Adult Primary Visual Characters of Each Sex in Various Role Categories Appearing in Commercials During Three Day Parts

		Percent					
		Daytime (N=668)		Evening (N=300)		Weekend (N=463)	
Role	N	Men (N=265)	Women (N=403)	Men (N=155)	Women (N=145)	Men (N=372)	Women (N=91)
Celebrity	234	18	8	29	10	24	4
Homemaker	60	2	10	1	5	2	2
Interviewer/ Demonstrator	164	13	16	5	19	6	9
Parent/ Spouse[a]	278	17	28	12	32	9	21
Professional	210	14	8	23	9	21	14
Sex Object/ Model	126	1	13	1	16	7	23
Worker	95	9	1	7	1	12	12
Other Role	264	26	15	23	8	19	14

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. Daytime X^2 (7, N=668) = 103.1, $p < .001$; Evening X^2 (7, N=300) = 87.0, $p < .001$; Weekend X^2 (7, N=463) = 47.0, $p < .001$; 3-way X^2 (14, N=1431) = 37.9, $p = .001$.
[a]Post-hoc category formed by combining "Parent" and "Spouse/Partner."

to be portrayed as spouses or parents but that "it appears that the depiction of men as spouses and parents is on the rise" (p. 601). Their own results indicated that 27% of the males and 53% of the females in their prime-time sample were portrayed as spouses or parents.

In the present study, 12% of the male and 32% of the female primary visual characters in the evening were portrayed as spouses or parents. Although the percentages vary, the proportion is roughly equal to that found by Bretl and Cantor. The discrepancy in exact percentages may be explained by the fact that the present study used somewhat different categories. The Bretl and Cantor research did not consider day part differences. As Table 12 indicates, a greater proportion of women primary characters portrayed spouses or parents in the evening (32%) than in daytime (28%) or on weekends (21%). Male primary characters were much more likely to portray spouses or parents during the day (17%) than during the evening (12%) or on the weekend (9%).

Analysis of Products Advertised

Several studies (e.g. Dominick & Rauch, 1972; Culley & Bennett, 1976; Marecek, et. al., 1978; Scheibe & Condry, 1984; and Bretl & Cantor, 1988) have examined differences in the sex of characters associated with various products. Harris and Stobart (1986), after Manstead & McCulloch (1981), used the following categories: "services," "body," "home," "food," and "auto." Because of the special interest in male-oriented weekend ads, the

present study added the categories "business products" and "alcohol."

Table 13 indicates the percentages of the ads falling into each of eight product categories in each of the three day parts.

Table 13

Percentage of Various Product Categories of Commercials During Three Day Parts

		Percent		
Category	N	Daytime (N=971)	Evening (N=498)	Weekend (N=740)
Alcohol	77	0	0	10
Automotive	298	1	16	29
Body	673	44	28	15
Bus Products/ Services[a]	271	3	9	27
Food	463	28	25	9
Home	357	24	15	6
Other	70	1	6	4

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (12, N=2209) = 904.6, $p < .001$.

[a] Post hoc category formed by combining "Business Products" and "Services."

Major differences were found in the products advertised in different dayparts. While virtually all the daytime ads (96%) fell into either the "body," "food," or "home" categories, only 30% of the weekend ads did so. On weekends, 29% of the ads were

for "automotive," and 27% were for "business products" or "services" (the category "business products" was used in only nine cases and so was combined with "services"). In the daytime period, 44% of the ads fell into the "body" category, while only 15% of the weekend ads did so. Almost no ads for "alcohol" were found in the daytime or evening sample, but 10% of those in the weekend sample fell into that category. These were mainly commercials for beer, with a few for wine and wine products (the advertising of hard liquor is prohibited on U.S. television by industry standards). A few commercials did not fall into one of the major categories and were coded as "other." These included such commercials as those for organizations (e.g. the U.S. Army and the American Association of Retired People) and for theatrical motion pictures. The data was then analyzed based on the sex of the adult primary character (Table 14).

As Table 14 indicates, portrayals by the sex of the adult primary characters in ads varied widely with the day part and product category. Forty-four percent of daytime male primary characters appeared in food commercials, compared to only 20% of the daytime female characters. However, on weekends, men and women primary characters appeared in food ads with about proportionately equal likelihood. Men were most likely to be primary characters in food or body commercials during daytime and prime time, but equally likely to be primary characters in automotive, body, or business product/services ads on weekends. Women were proportionately more likely than men to be portrayed in a body

Table 14

Percentage of Primary Visual Characters of Each Sex Appearing in Commercials for Various Product Categories During Three Day Parts

		Percent					
		Daytime (N=668)		Evening (N=300)		Weekend (N=463)	
Category	N	Men (N=265)	Women (N=403)	Men (N=155)	Women (N=145)	Men (N=372)	Women (N=91)
Alcohol	60	0	0	1	0	14	8
Automotive	131	0	0	9	7	22	26
Body	519	35	59	20	50	22	4
Bus Prods/ Services[a]	165	4	1	16	6	23	35
Food	310	44	20	28	19	9	7
Home	195	17	19	16	14	6	8
Other	51	0	1	10	3	4	12

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. Daytime X^2 (5, N=668) = 62.4, $p < .001$; Evening X^2 (6, N=300) = 36.1, $p < .001$; Weekend X^2 (6, N=463) = 28.2, $p < .001$; 3-way X^2 (10, N=1431) = 68.2 = $p < .001$.

[a] Post hoc category formed by combining "Business Products" and "Services."

ad in either daytime or prime time but less likely on weekends. On weekends, men were proportionately more likely than women to be the primary character in an alcohol ad, but proportionately less likely than women to be the primary character in an automotive or business product/ services commercial.

Harris and Stobart (1986) analyzed daytime and evening commercials on British television using nearly identical categories and although comparisons between British and U.S. television must be made with caution, the findings are similar. They found women were proportionately more likely to appear as "visual central figures" in body and household ads and less likely to appear in food ads during the daytime hours. As can be seen by Table 14, these findings are in agreement with the present study. During the evening, Harris and Stobart found that men were proportionately more likely to appear in food, automotive, and services ads and women more likely to appear in body, and household ads. The present study is in agreement on all evening measures except one. Men were proportionately more likely (16%) than women (14%) to appear in home ads. Harris and Stobart did not study weekend sports ads.

Analysis of Primary Setting

Table 15 details differences in the commercials' primary location or setting in the three day parts. The setting categories are nearly identical to those used by Bretl and Cantor (1988) except that instead of using their "unknown" category, the

present study used "other/unclear." The results indicate significant differences among the settings of the commercials appearing in the three day parts. A large percentage of commercials fell into the "other/unclear" category in all three day parts. These included a large number of commercials that clearly were shot in a studio as well as those in an indeterminate location or without

Table 15

Percentages of Primary Settings of Commercials Aired During Three Day Parts

Primary Setting	N	Percent		
		Daytime (n=971)	Evening (n=498)	Weekend (n=740)
Kitchen of Home	175	13	8	1
Bathroom of Home	56	4	2	1
Other Room of Home	322	20	14	8
Outdoors at Home	111	5	4	6
Outdoors Away from Home	624	15	31	44
Restaurant/Bar	75	4	2	4
Business	149	6	8	7
School	21	1	1	1
Other/Unclear	676	33	30	28

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (16, N=2209) = 271.0, $p < .001$.

any specific setting at all (e.g. voice over graphics, announcer in front of plain background). Of the categories depicting a specific location, most daytime commercials were set in the kitchen, "other room," or "outdoors away from home." An overwhelmingly major percentage of both evening and weekend ads were set "outdoors away from home."

Table 16 breaks these settings down by both day part and sex for those commercials with adult primary visual characters. Sex differences related to setting were small in the evening day part, and did not reach significance at the .05 level. Day time differences were significant, however. In that day part, women primary characters were proportionately more likely than men primary characters to appear in ads in all three indoors at home categories. Day time men were proportionately more likely to appear in ads set in the two outdoors categories as well as at business locations. Men and women primary characters were appeared with about proportionately equal frequency in a restaurant or bar during the daytime.

Weekend differences also appear to be large, but the chi-square test is suspect due to a low frequency in more than one fifth of the cells. These low frequencies are due to the near absence of any weekend commercials with settings of kitchen, bathroom, or school. However, results from the populous cells are still of interest. In the weekend day part, men were proportionately more likely than women to be portrayed outdoors away from home, but women proportionately more likely than men

Table 16

Percentages of Adult Primary Characters of Each Sex Appearing in Various Settings During Three Day Parts

Primary Setting	N	Percent					
		Daytime (N=668)		Evening[a] (N=300)		Weekend (N=463)	
		Men (N=265)	Women (N=403)	Men (N=155)	Women (N=145)	Men (N=372)	Women (N=91)
Kitchen	123	12	14	10	12	1	0
Bathroom	47	3	6	3	1	2	0
Other Room of Home	240	17	25	15	20	9	12
Outdoors at Home	81	8	3	3	6	6	11
Outdoors Away From Home	349	19	11	27	23	41	33
Restaurant/Bar	66	4	5	3	2	4	12
Business	128	9	6	14	8	10	10
School	17	0	1	1	0	2	1
Other/Unclear	380	27	29	24	28	26	21

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. Daytime X^2 (8, N=668) = 25.1, p=.001; Evening X^2 (8, N=300) = 10.4, p=.235; Weekend X^2 (8, N=463) = 16.5, p=.036 (Suspect due to low frequency in more than one-fifth of cells); 3-way X^2 (16, N=1431) = 28.6, p = .026 (Suspect due to low frequency in more than one-fifth of cells).

[a] This comparison was not significant at .05 level.

(12% vs. 4%) to be the primary visual character in restaurant/bar settings, and both were proportionately equally likely to appear in business locations.

Bretl and Cantor (1988) collapsed their settings categories into "home" and "away." Following their procedure, the present categories were also collapsed for comparison with Bretl and Cantor and other studies into "home," which included "kitchen," "bathroom," "other room of home," and "outdoors at home," and "away," which included "outdoors away from home," "restaurant/ bar," "business," and "school." Table 17 indicates the results.

Table 17

Percentages of Commercials in Three Setting Categories During Three Day Parts

Primary Setting	N	Percent		
		Daytime (n=971)	Evening (n=498)	Weekend (n=740)
Home	664	41	29	16
Away From Home	869	25	42	56
Other/ Unclear	676	33	30	28

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (4, N=2209) = 195.4, $p < .001$.

Once again, day part differences are significant. The largest percentage (41%) of daytime commercials are set in home locations while the largest percentage of those in the evening

(42%) and on weekends (56%) are set away from home. Table 18 breaks these findings down by both day part and sex for those commercials with adult primary characters. On this comparison, the "primary character sex" X "primary setting" interaction reached the .05 level of significance only in the daytime. In the daytime, women were proportionately more likely to appear as primary characters in home settings (44%) and men in away from home settings (40%). Although this trend seemed to be continued in the evening day part, the differences did not reach significance. In the weekend day part, men and women primary characters appeared in the different settings in almost equal proportions.

Bretl and Cantor (1988) also found that the differences between males and females portrayed at home in evening commercials was not great enough to reach statistical significance. They compared their results with three earlier studies (Dominick and Rauch, 1972; Culley and Bennett, 1976; and Schneider and Schneider, 1979). This comparison indicted that while the percentage of females portrayed at home in these studies has remained around 35% over the past 18 years, that the percentage of men portrayed at home has been increasing. The present study supports this conclusion as it pertains to the evening day part. However, significant differences in the proportion of ads set at home versus away from home exist among the day parts, and between male and female characters' portrayals in the daytime.

Table 18

Percentages of Adult Primary Characters of Each Sex Appearing in Each of Three Setting Categories During Three Day Parts

		Percent					
		Daytime (N=668)		Evening[a] (N=300)		Weekend[a] (N=463)	
Primary Setting	N	Men (N=265)	Women (N=403)	Men (N=155)	Women (N=145)	Men (N=372)	Women (N=91)
Home	410	32	44	28	34	12	12
Away from Home	641	40	27	48	39	63	67
Other/Unclear	380	27	29	24	28	26	21

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. Daytime X^2 (2, N=668) = 14.5, p = .001; Evening X^2 (2, N=300) = 2.9, p=.231; Weekend X^2 (2, N=463) = 1.0, p=.620; 3-way X^2 (4, N=1431) = 6.5, p = .163.

[a] This comparison was not significant at .05 level.

Analysis of Promised Rewards

Most previous studies have attempted to measure the way in which the commercial attempts to sell its product. Manstead & McCulloch (1981) and Harris and Stobart (1986) categorized each commercial by the type of reward promised. The present study modified the categories used in the latter study and classified each commercial into the reward categories indicated in Table 19..ls1

Table 19

Percentages of Commercials in Various Reward Categories Aired During Three Day Parts

Reward Category	N	Percent		
		Daytime (N=971)	Evening (N=498)	Weekend (N=740)
Pleasure	557	25	29	23
Practical	714	22	31	46
Self-enhancement	792	50	34	19
Other Reward	123	2	5	10
No Reward	23	1	1	2

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (8, N=2209) = 242.3, $p < .001$.

Again, significant differences were found in the type of reward offered in commercials among the three day parts. One-

half of the daytime commercials (50%) were coded as promising self-enhancement, a much higher proportion than in the evening (34%) or on weekends (19%). Weekend spots were mostly categorized as offering a practical reward (46%) and evening ads were nearly evenly divided among the pleasure (29%), practical (31%), and self-enhancement (34%) reward categories. The percentage of commercials offering pleasure as a reward was similar in all three day parts.

The category of "other reward" appeared in 10% of the weekend spots but in only 5% of the evening and 2% of the daytime spots. Further review of the commercials revealed that most of the "other reward" codings fell into one of two categories: First, many of these ads were for automobiles, and rewards were often subtly implied rather than stated. Second, several other commercials in this category were "image" ads, designed to give the viewer a feeling of confidence in, or respect for, a particular corporation. These too, offered only implied rewards.

Table 20 breaks these findings down by both day part and sex for those commercials with adult primary characters. The primary character sex X reward category interaction was significant in all three day parts. Men were proportionately more likely than women to be the primary character in daytime spots promising pleasure (35% vs 15%) or practical (19% vs 16%) rewards, but proportionately less likely to be the primary character in ads promising self-enhancement (43% vs. 67%). A similar pattern was evident during evening commercials. In weekend commercials, men

Table 20

Percentages of Adult Primary Characters of Each Sex in Commercials with Various Reward Categories During Three Day Parts

		Percent					
		Daytime (N=668)		Evening (N=300)		Weekend (N=463)	
Reward Category	N	Men (N=265)	Women (N=403)	Men (N=155)	Women (N=145)	Men (N=372)	Women (N=91)
Pleasure	369	35	15	39	17	29	24
Practical	369	19	16	26	21	36	49
Self-enhancement	616	43	67	26	58	27	11
Other Reward	65	2	2	8	3	7	14
No Reward	12	2	0	1	1	1	1

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. Daytime X^2 (4, N=668) = 49.0, $p < .001$; Evening X^2 (4, N=300) = 34.3, $p < .001$; Weekend X^2 (4, N=463) = 16.6, $p=.002$; 3-way X^2 (8, N=1431) = 40.7, $p < .001$.

were again proportionately more likely than women to be the primary character in ads offering pleasure (29% vs. 24%) but proportionately less likely to be in ads promising practical rewards (36% vs. 49%). Men were proportionately more likely than women to appear in self-enhancement ads (27% vs. 11%) in this day part.

The daytime results are quite similar, but not identical, to the findings of Harris and Stobart (1986). In their daytime sample, they found male "visual central characters" were proportionately more likely to appear in pleasure ads, but less likely to appear in practical or self-enhancement ads. In the evening, they found that men were proportionately more likely than women to appear in pleasure and practical spots, but less likely to appear in self-enhancement ads. Thus, in all cases except the daytime pleasure ads, the findings agree with those of the present study.

Analysis of Age and Gender of All Characters

While the above findings reveal a great deal about the gender portrayal of primary characters, the study also examined day part differences in portrayals of other characters appearing in the commercials. Each commercial was categorized as to the age and gender mix of all characters, regardless of their importance or time on the screen. The categories used were "all male adults," "all female adults," "all adults, mixed gender," "all children or teens," "male adults with children or teens but no

adult women," "female adults with children or teens but no adult men," a mixture of male and female adults and children and/or teens," and "no visual characters." The results are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Percentages of Commercials with Characters of Various Sex and Age Categories in Three Day Parts

		Percent		
Category	N	Daytime (N=888)	Evening (N=445)	Weekend (N=623)
All Male Adult	406	14	18	33
All Female Adults	291	20	19	5
All Adults, Mixed Gender	651	32	32	37
All Children or Teens	69	6	2	1
Male Adults w/Children/Teens (No Adult Women)	54	2	2	4
Female Adults w/Children/Teens (No Adult Men)	144	11	8	3
Mixture of Ages & Genders	341	16	20	18

Note. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (12, N=1956) = 196.1, $p < .001$. Figures do not include commercials without any visual characters.

Again, significant differences among the day parts were found. Although approximately equal percentages of ads during the evening hours portrayed either all adult male (18%) or all adult female characters (19%), commercials with all adult male characters were more than twice as likely to be found during weekend (33%) as daytime (14%) telecasts. Conversely, commercials with only adult female characters made up only five percent of the weekend sample, but 20% of that during the daytime hours. Commercials showing only adult men with children were relatively rare in all three day parts, but those featuring only adult women with children made up 11% of the daytime and eight percent of the evening sample. Commercials with only children or teen characters made up six percent of the daytime but only one percent of the weekend ads.

Analysis of Primary Narrator

The gender of the narrator or off-screen announcer has long been a focus of content analyses. Past studies have uniformly found an overwhelming majority of commercials to have male narrators. When Bretl and Cantor (1988) summarized these findings, they found that in 11 previous studies, the percentage of commercials having male narrators ranged from 84 to 95%. The present study attempted to determine whether there were day part differences in the percentages of ads using male narrators. As Table 22 indicates, such was found to be the case.

Although male narrators clearly form a large majority in all day parts, differences are large enough to be significant. While

male narrators were heard on virtually all weekend ads (97%) with narrators, a smaller percentage (91%) were found in the evening ads. For the daytime commercials, the percentage dropped even further (to 86%). Although not revealed by the data in Table 22, 332 commercials in the overall sample did not have narrators, but even on this measure, there were day part differences. Twenty percent of all daytime commercials had no narrators, a much larger proportion than either the evening (12%) or weekends (11%).

Table 22

Gender Percentages of Primary Narrators in Commercials Aired During Three Day Parts

Narrator Sex	N	Percent		
		Daytime (N=780)	Evening (N=438)	Weekend (N=659)
Male	1692	84	91	97
Female	185	16	9	3

Note. Commercials without a narrator are excluded. All numbers except N represent column percentages. X^2 (2, N=1877) = 61.2, $p < .001$.

Although the small number of women narrators in the sample makes further detailed analysis tenuous, the data does suggest that when women were heard as narrators it was overwhelmingly for products classified as "body." Sixty percent of the women narrators heard during the daytime and 62% of those heard in the evening were in commercials for "body" products. This finding agrees with the earlier results of Bretl & Cantor (1988).

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that there are large and consistent differences in the way gender is portrayed in network television commercials to different day part audiences. Television advertising's picture of sex roles and family relationships varies greatly between the ads presented to the mostly-female daytime audience and those presented to the mostly-male weekend audience. While the daytime commercial tends to portray men from the perspective of home and family, the weekend ad is replete with masculine escapist fantasy, frequently portraying men with admiring women looking on or in male groups without any women at all. Male weekend activity in these commercials centers around fun and excitement in which beer and automobiles play a major part.

The Daytime World of TV Advertising

The daytime world of television advertising, aimed primarily at women, reflects the stereotypical world of the housewife's day. Ads are focused on household cleaning, child care, food preparation, or body care. Most of the adult primary characters in these ads are women, but men, children and teens appear frequently. When a specific locale is portrayed, the commercials are most likely to be set in the home, and frequently in the kitchen. Overwhelmingly, these ads promise their viewers self-enhancement as a reward for using the product. Women narrators are heard on a few ads during the daytime, but almost always in

ads for products dealing with the body. These results generally agree with the findings of earlier studies.

Men who appear as primary characters in the daytime world are usually portrayed at home and are generally hungry (44% appear in ads for food) or potential partners for romance (35% appear in ads for body products). They most frequently are portrayed as either husbands or celebrities. Although often portrayed as husbands, they only rarely appear to have responsibility for child care.

Children (including teens) appear frequently in the daytime world, being portrayed in 35% of the daytime commercials with visual characters. In fact, children were primary characters in 14% of these ads.

The Weekend World of TV Advertising

The weekend world of TV ads is far different. Aimed at men, it is full of action, fun, and excitement, much like the sports events in which the commercials appear. Men dominate these commercials, appearing as the primary character 80% of the time. Traditional male stereotypes are frequently exploited as evidenced even by the types of products heavily advertised on weekends: cars, business products and services, and beer. Weekend ads frequently feature celebrities as the primary characters; these are almost always men and are often sports figures. Other ads show primary characters at work, as either professionals or

other workers. Only rarely do they portray homemakers, parents, or spouses, and when this does occur, it is generally women who appear in these roles. The weekend world is a world away from home and family, but not necessarily always at work. Most weekend commercials are set in locations other than the home, frequently outdoors, and most often doing something other than work. When primary characters do appear at home or at a place of business, they are frequently women. Ads aimed at the male weekend audience are far more likely to offer practicality rather than either pleasure or self-enhancement as rewards for using the product, but these practical ads frequently feature women as the primary characters. However, the narrator for these and all other ads is almost certain to be a male.

In general, women play a less important role in weekend commercials, appearing as primary characters in only 20% of the ads having adult primary characters. They are frequently absent altogether from ads (37% of the weekend spots with visual characters portrayed no adult women). When women do appear on weekends, they are most often portrayed as sex objects or models (23% of the women primary characters on weekends were so classified), or as mothers, wives, or girlfriends (21%).

Children (and teens) are also less important in weekend commercials. Only 25% of the ads with visual characters portray any children, and children rarely appear as the primary characters in weekend spots.

Alcohol consumption plays a special role in weekend commercials, with 10% of all ads being for alcoholic beverages (almost all of these for beer). This is especially striking when compared to the other two day parts in which alcohol ads were almost non-existent. The beer ads seemed especially likely to be tied to traditional symbols of masculinity and male camaraderie. Eighty-eight percent of the weekend alcohol ads featured male primary characters. Women sometimes do appear in these ads, but frequently portray waitresses, dates, potential pick-ups, or even more blatant sex objects.

Automobiles and automotive products are also an important part of the weekend world, making up 29% of the ads. Interestingly, women played a proportionately more extensive roles in auto ads than beer ads, making up 23% of the adult primary characters in auto commercials. However, as with the beer ads, they seemed especially likely to be portrayed as overt sex objects or as models, driving or even caressing the automobiles. Other women are portrayed in the background of automobile commercials, frequently watching men as they drive by.

Similar situations are found in ads for business products and services. These make up 27% of the weekend ads and males are the primary characters in 73% of these commercials. Although these ads frequently portrayed women as secretaries, hotel receptionists, and in other male-subservient positions, a substantial number did show women in what appeared to be socially equal positions in the business world, such as in offices or attending

business meetings. But even in these ads, it was clear that it was the men who were "in charge."

Commercial Style

The results suggest that part of the day part differences can be attributed to a difference in the style of the commercials. Daytime ads frequently are cast in the "slice of life" format in which a character (usually a woman) is portrayed in a realistic setting (usually the home). She is confronted with a problem which is solved through the use of the product. Often she is given advice by another character (frequently a neighbor or friend) or by an unseen narrator. In some commercials, a male appears (usually a husband) who is stumped by a household problem (usually concerning food, medicine or cleaning). A woman (usually the wife) solves the problem through her "expertise" in household affairs and, of course, her use of the product.

The weekend commercial style is more fast-paced, and is filled with sometimes frenetic away-from-home action, fast cuts, fantasy and excitement. A writer (significantly, a woman) for Sports Illustrated has commented on the style:

> These commercials, with their desperately hot music and pretty people, make me feel like I'm not leading an interesting life. . . . The message seems to be that [the characters] have done an honest day's work and now it's time to play hard. (Moser, 1988, January 18, p. 102)

The weekend ads mimic the escapism of the sporting events in which they appear, and Messner (1987) has explained the pleasure this may offer to men:

> . . . on a symbolic/ideological level for spectators and fans, sport has become one of the 'last bastions' of male power and superiority over -- and separation from -- the 'feminization' of society. The rise of football as "America's number-one game" is likely the result of the comforting clarity it provides between the polarities of traditional male power, strength, and violence and the contemporary fears of social feminization. (p. 54)

Certainly, escapist male fantasy is found in the male-dominated weekend ads, which frequently exploit and reinforce traditional male stereotypes such as those found by Chavetz (1978), Postman, et al. (1987), and Scheibe & Condry (1984), and discussed above. Beer ads offer male camaraderie, truck commercials promise toughness, and business ads suggest the pathway to success.

Perhaps the most surprising outcome is the magnitude of the day part differences found. In all but one comparison, differences were significant at the .05 level and in the majority of comparisons, "p" was less than .001. Large differences suggest that the television day part cannot be ignored as a variable in studying gender portrayals. Unfortunately, most past research has done just that. The results from studies such as those by Marecek, et al. (1978) and Scheibe (1979), which indiscriminately mixed commercials from various day parts must now be reevaluated. Likewise, the findings of the many studies

which drew their sample only from prime time (e.g. Dominick & Rauch, 1972; Lovdal, 1989; and Silverstein & Silverstein, 1974) must now be questioned as to their generalizability.

Fiske and Hartley (1978) have written that "The starting-point of any study of television must be with what is actually there on the screen. This is what content analysis is concerned to establish" (p. 21). This study was meant to be a preliminary attempt to quantify the images of men in network television commercials as a basis for further study. The limits of content analysis are well known; however, the results do suggest several areas for further study. More close textual analysis needs to be conducted to examine the way commercials aimed at men work, and a Freudian analysis of beer, automotive, and business ads might be extremely revealing. The application of some of the newer concepts emerging from men's studies scholars could also be usefully applied. Finally, additional work needs to be done on how (and why) men watch television.

References

August, E. (1985). Men's studies: A selected and annotated interdisciplinary bibliography. Littleton CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Barwise, P. & Ehrenberg, A. (1988). Television and its audience. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bretl, D. J. & Cantor, J. (1988). The portrayal of men and women in U.S. television commercials: A recent content analysis and trends over 15 years. Sex Roles, 18(9/10), 595-609.

Brod, H. (1987). Toward men's studies. In M. Kimmel (Ed.), Changing men (pp. 263-277). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Chafetz, J. (1978). Masculine, feminine or human?: An overview of the sociology of the gender roles (2nd ed.). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Chappell, B. (1983, June). How women are portrayed in television commercials. Admap 327-331.

Courtney, A. & Whipple, T. (1983). Sex stereotyping in advertising. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Craig, S. (1987). Marketing American masculinity: Mythology and flow in the Super Bowl telecasts. Paper presented at the meeting of the Popular Culture Association, Montreal.

Culley, J. D. & Bennett, R. (1976). Selling women, selling blacks. Journal of Communication, 26(4), 160-174.

David, D. S. & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Dominick, J. & Rauch, G. (1972). The image of women in network TV commercials. Journal of Broadcasting, 16(3), 259-265.

Doolittle, J. & Pepper, R. (1975). Children's TV ad content: 1974. Journal of Broadcasting, 19(2), 131-142.

Downs, A. C. & Harrison, S. K. (1985). Embarrassing age spots or just plain ugly? Physical attractiveness stereotyping as an instrument of sexism on American television commercials. Sex Roles, 13(1/2), 9-19.

Durkin, K. (1985). Television and sex-role acquisition 1: Content. British Journal of Social Psychology, 24, 101-113.

Ellis, J. (1982). Visible fictions. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Farhi, P. (1988, September 11). In ad game, sports means men, and that means more money. The Washington Post, H6.

Farrell, W. (1974). The liberated man: Beyond masculinity: freeing men and their relationships with women. New York: Random House.

Fasteau, M. (1974). The male machine. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fienberg, S. E. (1980). The analysis of cross-classified categorical data (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Fiske, J. (1987). Television culture. New York: Methuen.

Fiske, J. & Hartley, J. (1978). Reading television. New York: Methuen.

Friedan, B. (1963). The feminine mystique. NY: Dell.

Furnham, A. & Voli, V. (1989). Gender stereotypes in Italian television advertisements. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 33(2), 175-185.

Gilly, M. C. (1988). Sex roles in advertising. Journal of Marketing, 52, 75-85.

Gunter, B. (1986). Television and sex role stereotyping. London: John Libbey.

Harris, P. & Stobart, J. (1986). Sex-role stereotyping in British television advertisements at different times of the day: An extension and refinement of Manstead & McCulloch (1981). British Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 155-164.

Hennessee, J. A. & Nicholson, J. (1972, May 28). NOW says: TV commercials insult women. New York Times Magazine, 12-13, 48-51.

Kear, L. (1985, September). Television and sex roles: A selected annotated bibliography. Unpublished Manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 444).

Kervin, D. (1988, November). Definitions of masculinity: Representations of men in fifty years of Esquire advertising. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kim, W. Y., Baran, S.J., & Massey, K. K.. (1988). Impact of the VCR on control of television viewing. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 32(3), 351-358.

Knill, B. J., Pesch, M., Pursey, G., Gilpin, P. & Perloff, R. M. (1981). Still typecast after all these years? Sex role portrayals in television advertising. International Journal of Women's Studies, 4(5), 497-506.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Livingstone, S. & Green, G. (1986). Television advertisements and the portrayal of gender. British Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 149-154.

Lovdal, L. T. (1989). Sex role messages in television commercials: An update. Sex Roles, 21(11/12), 715-724.

Macklin, M.C. & Kolbe, R.H. (1984). Sex role stereotyping in children's advertising: Current and past trends. Journal of Advertising, 13, 34-42.

Mamay, P. D. & Simpson, R. L. (1981). Three female roles in television commercials. Sex Roles, 7(12), 1223-1232.

Manstead, A. S. R., & McCulloch, C. (1981). Sex-role stereotyping in British television advertisements. British Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 181-188.

Marecek, J., Piliavin, J. A., Fitzsimmons, E., Krogh, E.C., Leader, E., & Trudell, B. (1978). Women as TV experts: The voice of authority. Journal of Communication, 28(1), 159-168.

McArthur, L. & Resko, B. (1975). The portrayal of men and women in American television commercials." Journal of Social Psychology, 97(2), 209-220.

Messner, M. (1987). Male identity in the life course of the jock. In M. Kimmel (Ed.), Changing men (pp. 53-67). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Meyers, R. (1980, November). An examination of the male sex role model in prime time television commercials. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 437)

Moser, P. W. (1988, January 18). Time out for fandangos. Sports Illustrated, p. 102.

Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. Screen, 16(3), 6-18.

Neale, S. (1983). Masculinity as spectacle. Screen, 24(6), 2-16.

Nielsen Media Research. (1988, November). Nielsen Television Index national audience demographics report, Volume 1. Northbrook, IL: Nielsen Media Research.

O'Donnell, W. & O'Donnell, K. (1978). Update: Sex-role messages in TV commercials. Journal of Communication, 28(1), 156-158.

O'Kelly, C. & Bloomquist, L. (1976). Women and blacks on TV. Journal of Communication, 26(4), 179-184.

Pleck, J. H. & Sawyer, J. (Eds.). (1974). Men and masculinity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Postman, N., Nystrom, C., Strate, L., & Weingartner, C. (1987). Myths, men, & beer: An analysis of beer commercials. Falls Church, VA: AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290 074)

Rak, D. & McMullen, L. (1987). Sex-role stereotyping in television commercials: A verbal response mode and content analysis. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science. 19, 25-39.

The Roper Organization, Inc. (1980). The 1980 Virginia Slims American women's opinion poll. Storrs, CN: The Roper Center, University of Connecticut.

Scheibe, C. (1979). Sex roles in TV commercials. Journal of Advertising Research, 19(1), 23-27.

Scheibe, C. L. & Condry, J. C. (1984, August). Character portrayals and social values in TV commercials. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 827)

Schneider, K. C. & Schneider, S. B. (1979). Trends in sex roles in television commercials. Journal of Marketing, 43(3), 79-84.

Schwichtenberg, C. (1987). Articulating the people's politics: Manhood and right-wing populism in 'The A-Team.'" Communication, 9, 379-398.

Seggar, J., Hafen, J. & Hannonen-Gladden, H. (1981). Television's portrayals of minorities and women in drama and comedy drama 1971-80. Journal of Broadcasting, 25(3), 277-288.

Silverstein, A. J., & Silverstein, R. (1974). The portrayal of women in television advertising. 'Federal Communications Bar Journal, 27(1), 71-98.

Skelly, G. & Lundstrom, W. (1981). Male sex roles in magazine advertising, 1959-1979. Journal of Communication, 31(4), 52-57.

Steeves, H. (1987). Feminist theories and media studies. Critical Studies in Mass Communication 4(2), 95-135.

Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Pleck, J. (1987). The structure of male role norms. In M. S. Kimmel (Ed.), Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity (pp. 25-36). Newbury Park CA: Sage.

Verna, M. E. (1975). The female image in children's TV commercials. Journal of Broadcasting, 19(3), 301-309.

Wernick, A. (1987). From voyeur to narcissist: Imaging men in contemporary advertising. In M. Kaufman (Ed.), Beyond patriarchy: Essays by men on pleasure, power, and change (pp. 277-297). New York: Oxford.

Wilkinson, Leland. (1989). SYSTAT: The system for statistics. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT, Inc.

Appendix

Operational Definitions Used By Coders

PRIMARY VISUAL CHARACTER refers to the one visual character who appears on the screen the longest, but no less than 5 seconds. Use a stopwatch, if necessary, to determine which character is on the screen the longest. If screen time is equal, choose the character with the most screen time and who speaks the longest. If the speaking length is also equal, choose the one character with the most screen time, the longest speaking length, and on whom attention seems to be focused or who seems to be directing the action. If there are no visual characters, or if no character appears on the screen for at least 5 seconds, code as "none."

PRIMARY VISUAL CHARACTER CREDIBILITY CATEGORIES:

1. **AUTHORITY:** The primary or predominant visual character is portrayed primarily as a person with authoritative information about the product or service based on education, technical knowledge, research or some similar expertise rather than as experience as a user.

2. **USER:** The primary or predominant visual character is portrayed primarily as a user of the product or service, or as someone whose knowledge of the product's abilities came from personal experience and use of the product rather than research or other authoritative sources. Also code as a user someone who it appears will become a user as a direct result of information or advice imparted in the commercial.

0. **OTHER:** The primary or predominant visual character does not fit into either of the two above categories.

-. **NO PRIMARY CHARACTER:** This question should be coded - if and only if Question A was coded -.

PRIMARY VISUAL CHARACTER ROLE CATEGORIES: What appears to be the primary or predominant role of the primary visual character in the commercial? (If the primary character portrays more than one role, choose the on that seems primary or predominant for this commercial in terms of length of portrayal. Use a stopwatch if necessary).

1. **CELEBRITY:** Characters who appear to be well-known to the intended audience (even if you do not recognize them yourself). INCLUDE: Movie stars, sports figures, models, well-known performers, corporate executives, etc.

2. **CHILD/ TEEN:** Non-adult characters whose major characterization is being a child. Children who appear to fall into other categories as well (e.g. celebrity) should be coded into the category that seems best to describe their role in the commercial.

3. **HOME-MAKER:** Adult character appears to be primarily involved in working around the home at duties other than parenting or child care. INCLUDE: Cooking, cleaning, yardwork, home repairs (to the extent they are

being done by someone who appears to live in the home). DO NOT INCLUDE: Work in or around the home that is apparently being done by outside or hired help (e.g. a plumber), work in and around the home that is predominantly parenting (e.g. bathing, feeding, diapering baby, etc.).

4. **INTERVIEWER/ DEMONSTRATOR:** Non-celebrity adult characters who appear to have a primary or predominant function of narration, explanation, or demonstration of the product or service, including those primarily engaged in interviewing or questioning other characters. DO NOT INCLUDE: Celebrity spokespersons.

5. **PARENT/ CHILD CARE:** Adult character appears to be primarily involved in parenting or child care, regardless of whether they are portrayed as the actual parents.

6. **PROFESSIONAL:** Non-celebrity adults apparently engaged in activities traditionally associated with white collar or professional jobs or other jobs traditionally requiring a college degree or extensive professional training. INCLUDE: Lawyers, judges, doctors, auto salespersons, professional athletes and coaches, store salespersons, insurance salespersons, business executives, entrepreneurs, airplane pilots, etc. DO NOT INCLUDE: Waiters or waitresses, restaurant workers, clerical, secretarial workers, (use WORKER for these),

or others whose job is primarily to assist a professional. DO NOT INCLUDE: Military personnel (use OTHER for these).

7. **SEX OBJECT/ MODEL:** A non-celebrity adult character whose primary or predominant function appears to be decorative or alluring either to other characters or to the audience, or whose sole purpose seems to be as a fashion or makeup model, etc. DO NOT INCLUDE: Characters who are attractive, glamorous, or alluringly dressed but appear to be primarily engaged in one of the other roles (e.g. a handsome, muscular construction worker; an attractive woman who appears to be a parent).

8. **SPOUSE/ PARTNER:** Adult character's role in the commercial appears to be as a husband, wife, or lover with a long term relationship.

9. **WORKER:** Adults apparently engaged in activities traditionally associated with blue-collar occupations or service, to include occupations that primarily assist professionals. INCLUDE: Factory workers, construction workers, plumbers, electricians, automotive repair and service workers, appliance repair workers, air stewards and stewardesses, cooks, waiters, waitresses, maids, servants, butlers, restaurant workers, nurses, secretaries, bookkeepers, clerical workers,

bank tellers. DO NOT INCLUDE: Persons casually working in or around their own homes (e.g. mopping floors, doing yardwork).

0. **OTHER:** Any character role not falling into one of the above categories.

-: **NO PRIMARY CHARACTER:** Use this code if and only if Question A was coded -.

VISUAL CHARACTERS: Refers to all characters who appear on the screen, regardless of whether they were previously coded as primary or secondary character and regardless of length of screen appearance. All characters who appear on screen, even those appearing for less than 5 seconds should be considered. You may need to review some commercials and carefully note background characters. You need not consider characters whose gender and age cannot be clearly determined after a close review (e.g. drivers in distant cars, people in distant crowds, etc.).

1. **ALL MALE ADULTS:** The visual characters appear to be all male adults.

2. **ALL FEMALE ADULTS:** The visual characters appear to be all female adults.

3. **ALL ADULTS, MIXED GENDER:** The visual characters appear to be all adults, but with both male and females.

4. **ALL CHILDREN/ TEENS:** The visual characters appear to be all teens and children, with no adults.

5. **MALE ADULTS WITH CHILDREN/ TEENS BUT NO ADULT WOMEN:**

6. **FEMALE ADULTS WITH CHILDREN/ TEENS BUT NO ADULT MEN:**

7. **MIXTURE OF MALE AND FEMALE ADULTS AND CHILDREN/ TEENS:**

- **NO VISUAL CHARACTERS:** Use this code if and only if Questions A and B were coded -.

PRIMARY NARRATOR: Any voice which is heard but which cannot be attributed to an on-screen character (i.e., the person is never seen on camera) is to be considered a narrator voice. A person can not be both a narrator and a character.

DO NOT CODE AS NARRATORS THE FOLLOWING:

(1) A voice is off-camera at first, but which can be later attributed to one of the visual characters.

(2) A voice which represents the "thoughts" of the character (i.e. the character does not speak the lines but rather thinks them).

(3) A voice which can be attributed to one of the visual characters, even if only a part of the body (i.e. the hands) is ever seen.

(4) Voices that sing, unless the voice also narrates.

DO CODE AS NARRATORS THE FOLLOWING:

(1) A voice that cannot be attributed to a visual character even if it interacts with a visual character from offscreen.

(2) A voice on a telephone which belongs to a person never seen on camera.

In the case of multiple narrators, code only the one whose voice is heard for the longest time. Use a stopwatch if necessary.

PRODUCT CATEGORIES:

1. **ALCOHOL**: Any beverages that contain alcohol and the places that serve them. INCLUDE: Beer, wine, wine coolers, bars.

2. **AUTOMOTIVE**: Cars, trucks and supplies and accessories used with them. INCLUDE: cars, trucks, motorcycles & scooters, golf carts, gas, oil, auto servicing and repairs, tires, batteries, auto parts. DO NOT INCLUDE: automobile financing services or insurance (use SERVICES for these).

3. **BODY**: Products or services involving bodily health, hygiene, cleansing or clothing, including materials applied to the human body to improve appearance or attractiveness. Prescription and over the counter

preparations or materials designed to alleviate disease, illness, or pain or other symptoms. INCLUDE: lipstick, eyeshadow, perfume, after shave lotion, hair dyes and colorings, hair sprays and styling gels, deodorants, shampoo, toothpastes, mouthwash, lotions, face and hand creams, soap, shampoo and conditioner, toothpaste, denture cleaners, mouthwash, shaving cream, lotions, face and hand creams laxatives, first aid supplies, disposable diapers, clothing, shoes, aspirin and other pain relievers, cold medications, medicated ointments, sprays, and creams, bandages, ice packs, diet pills, plans, and special diet foods.

4. **BUSINESS PRODUCTS**: Products (but not services) primarily used by businesses. INCLUDE: Computers, fax machines, copiers, telephone or other equipment clearly for business or professional use (Exceptions: computers, telephones, or other appliances advertised clearly for home use). DO NOT INCLUDE: televisions, radios, other communication devices generally used only at home, magazines, books & newspapers, services (such as financial services, phone services, etc.).

5. **FOOD**: Any non-alcoholic, non-medicinal product to be eaten or drunk and restaurants, groceries, and other establishments primarily engaged in food preparation, sales and services. INCLUDE: Restaurants, fast food chains, proprietary food items such as Burger King

Whoppers and Pizza Hut pizza. DO NOT INCLUDE: Bars, beer, wine, or wine coolers, pet food, food sold as part of an organized diet plan.

6. **HOME**: Non-food, non-body items used in the home. INCLUDE: Detergents, cleaners, bleaches, paper products, furniture, dishes, toys, pet food and supplies, consumer appliances, (Stoves, refrigerators, washers, dryers, microwaves, televisions, stereos, etc.). Media products used at home (Magazines, newspapers, books and book clubs, pre-recorded video tapes, records & CDs). EXCEPTIONS: Any of these products (such as telephones, magazines, or computers for which the ads clearly indicate that their primary or predominant use would be in business). DO NOT INCLUDE: Disposable diapers (use BODY for these), services (such as banking), or computers, or other appliances that are clearly being advertised for use in businesses. DO NOT INCLUDE: Movies running in theaters (as opposed to home VCR rentals or home cable service). Code movies in theaters as OTHER.

7. **SERVICES**: Financial, transportation, communication services used by home or business. INCLUDE: Insurance, real estate agencies, banks, credit cards, loan companies, investment firms, stocks, bonds and mutual funds, airlines, trains, bus services, travel agencies, hotels and motels, mail, package and courier delivery serv-

ices, telephone services, computer software services, copy and printing services. DO NOT INCLUDE: Ads for the military (use OTHER for these).

0. **OTHER**: Products and services not clearly falling into one of the above categories, or falling into multiple categories. INCLUDE: Sporting goods, theatrical motion pictures, military service, store ads where multiple types of products are featured (However, if a single ad features several examples of the same type of product, code it as that type. i.e. a commercial featuring refrigerators, washers, and dishwashers would be coded "HOME."

PRIMARY SETTING CATEGORIES: What appears to be the primary or predominant location of the commercial? A few ads may use multiple settings. In these cases use the stopwatch to determine which setting category is on the screen longest. If several settings fall into the same category and their combined screen time is the longest, code with that setting category.

1. **KITCHEN OF HOME**: The primary or predominant location appears to be a kitchen in someone's home.

2. **BATHROOM OF HOME**: The primary or predominant location appears to be a bathroom in someone's home.

3. **OTHER ROOM OF HOME**: The primary or predominant location appears to be inside someone's home, but in a

room other than the kitchen or bathroom. (Including indoors in the garage).

4. **OUTDOORS AT HOME**: The primary or predominant location appears to be at someone's home, but is outdoors in the area surrounding the home.

5. **OUTDOORS AWAY FROM HOME**: All other outdoors locations not included in 4.

6. **RESTAURANT/ BAR**: Primary or predominant location appears to be indoors at a restaurant, bar, or other establishment which has its predominant business the serving of food or drink.

7. **BUSINESS**: Primary or predominant location is an indoor place of business but not a restaurant or bar. Including hotels and motels.

8. **SCHOOL**: Indoors at school.

0. **OTHER/ UNCLEAR**: Any primary or predominant location which does not fall into one of the above categories, to include commercials with indeterminate locations.

REWARD CATEGORIES: What appears to be the primary or predominant purported benefit promised by the ad for using the advertised product or service? (If multiple rewards are offered, choose the one that appears to you to be the primary or predominant one).

1. **PLEASURE**: The product or service will give immediate pleasure to the user (i.e. tastes good, feels good, is beautiful to see, is nice to experience). DO NOT INCLUDE: Ads with a major promises of better health or appearance (use SELF-ENHANCEMENT), or convenience (use PRACTICAL), even if these things will also be pleasurable.

2. **PRACTICAL**: User primarily receives a saving of time, effort, or money (i.e. lowest price, easy to use, easy to prepare, most convenient, makes some task easier), or the user will be physically safer (i.e. car stops better).

3. **SELF-ENHANCEMENT**: An improvement in health, appearance, or social or career status (i.e. look better, feel better). User will gain approval from family, friends, or opposite sex (i.e. your family will love you, your friends will respect you). Product will assist progress in some social or occupational hierarchy (i.e. beat the business competition).

0. **OTHER PROMISED REWARD**: A reward is promised but it does not fit into one of the above categories.

-. **NONE**: No rewards are suggested.

General Notes and Definitions

MEN and WOMEN refers to characters who appear to be at least 18 years of age. TEENS and CHILDREN refers to characters who appear to be age 17 or younger. The sex of teens and children is not coded.

VISUAL CENTRAL CHARACTERS refers to characters, depicted visually, who appear on the screen for at least five seconds, regardless of whether or not they speak or interact with other characters. No more than two visual central characters are to be coded for each commercial. If there are more than two characters who are on the screen for five seconds, use a stopwatch to find the two who are on the screen the longest. Some commercials may have no visual characters depicted at all (for example, a commercial showing a car with voice over narration). When such cases occur, code Questions A to D with -. A few ads are "montage" style with a great many characters, each having nearly equal amounts of screen time. In these ads, no one character may seem more important than any other. In such cases you must still use the stopwatch to locate those characters who are on the screen the longest and second longest time. If no character is on screen for at least 5 seconds, code A to D as -. If only one character is on the screen for 5 seconds or more, code that character as the primary and code B as -.

For each question their must be one and only one coded response. In cases where you must decide between two categories, use the stopwatch to determine screentime.

In some ads, you may be given only vague clues as to a location or character role. Rewind the tape and watch the commercial as many times as you wish to clarify these, then use your best judgment without conjecture. That is, base your judgments on what you see, rather than what you suppose to be the case. For example, say a commercial portrays a man dressed in a coat and tie holding a briefcase and standing at a train platform. It would be logical to code such a person as a "professional." Another ad portrays a man dressed in casual clothes driving an expensive car. It would not be logical to code such a person as a "professional" simply because the car looks to be expensive.

In a few ads, only parts of a body (e.g. the hands) of a character may be seen. Treat this appearance as a character and code him/her based on what you see and hear. For example, if you see only a woman's hands doing dishes and hear a woman's voice describing the product, it would be reasonable to code this as a female visual character.

Some ads use animation. This includes cartoon characters, live animals made to behave like humans, or inanimate objects which are given human characteristics (e.g. talking toilets or beer bottles). Code all such characters just as if they were human. (e.g. if the talking toilets or beer bottles have masculine adult voices, code them as adult males. If they have the longest screen time, code them as the primary visual characters, etc.). Treat animated locations in the same way. If an animated ad takes place in an animated bathroom, code it as a bathroom.